



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/600,209

06/20/2003

Dhananjay V. Keskar

042390.P16126

9022

59796

7590

07/08/2010

INTEL CORPORATION

c/o CPA Global

P.O. BOX 52050

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

SMITH, CREIGHTON H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2614

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/08/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9, 10, 12-14, 16-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bork et al in view of O'Neill et al.

On page 8 of applicant's remarks filed on 03 AUG '09 and on page 8 of the remarks filed on 07 DEC '09 applicant argues that Bork et al make no attempt to utilize user scheduling information. Examiner agrees with this statement. However, it is not the Bork reference that examiner is relying on to teach this element. It is the O'Neill reference examiner is relying on to teach this user scheduling information in P.0076, disclosed as a Personal Information Manager 164. How these 2 references can be combined is straightforward. Both Bork et al and O'Neill et al are teaching software method steps to program mobile phones, and to take a software step out of one reference (O'Neill et al) and place it in Bork et al would have required no more than common sense from a skill artisan in the wireless communications arts.

Bork et al wireless communication device has an intelligent alerting system, col. 3, lines 34-36. The wireless device has an alerting system that is determined from the operating environment. The terminal's CPU will adjust the audio, visual, and tactile alerting signals based on a user's "physical context information," col. 2, lines 4-6 & 57-65, where Bork et al discloses that the wireless device samples the noise levels surrounding the terminal and other inputs such as light sensing, temperature sensing,

Art Unit: 2614

motion sensing and the date. Bork's light, temperature, and motion sensing inputs read upon applicant's "physical context information" and Bork's real-time clock including date reads upon applicant's "location information." Also see col. 6, lines 53-60; col. 7, lines 53-61. Bork et al disclose a real-time clock 202 (including date) – col. 9, lines 42 et seq. The date, i.e., the "time of day" disclosed by Bork et al reads upon applicant's location information.

Bork et al fail to disclose that schedule information is one of the inputs that is going into their alerting system. However, O'Neill et al do disclose in P.0076 a Personal Information Manager that keeps a calendar for the customer notifying him/her of appointments, meetings, deadlines, etc. To have incorporated O'Neill et al teaching of using a calendar used as the scheduling information as part of the alerting/notifying means in Bork et al wireless device would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art because both Bork et al and O'Neill et al are disclosing different input means that are used to generate alerts in mobile devices, and the skilled artisan in the wireless arts, with these 2 references in front of her, would have found them readily combinable because of the fact that different inputs are being used to generate the alerts in Bork than in O'Neill, but common sense would show that the alerts of either reference could easily be used in the other reference. Applicant has taken old and well known elements from both Bork et al and O'Neill et al and arranged them in their application to perform the same function and has yielded no new results.

For claim 2, Bork et al disclose in col. 2, line 7 that the mobile device will modify its behavior notification by generating either a tactile or visual signal. This meets

Art Unit: 2614

applicant's limitation of claim 2 of a flashing display screen and a blinking LED. For claim 4, Bork et al disclose in col. 2, lines 35 et seq. that one of the physical pieces of information is passive audible sensing of the environment which meets applicant's limitation in claim 4 of "ambient noise information." In lines 56 et seq. of col. 2, Bork et al disclose some other physical pieces of information that affect the alerting signal in the wireless device are: Light sensing, temperature sensing, and motion sensing. For claim 18, see Bork et al, cols. 10-11, lines 65-67 & 1-4.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to CREIGHTON SMITH at telephone number (571)272-7546.

/CREIGHTON SMITH/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614

06 JUL '10